

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are in the application of which claims 1, 14, 26, 29, 32, and 34 are in independent form. Claims 20, 21, and 35 are amended to overcome 35 USC § 112 rejections. An appendix after the signature page shows amendments.

35 USC § 112, second paragraph. Claims 20, 21, and 35 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph. Each of these claims is amended to overcome the rejection. Applicants thank the Examiner for noticing these errors.

35 USC § 102(b). Claims 1-3, 6, 12-17, and 26-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Faria, UK Patent Application GB 2316278A. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 1 recites: “scrambling the blocks of the digital video signal responsive to a remote computer number.” (Emphasis added.)

Faria does not teach this. Rather, Faria teaches encrypting data using a user identity codes UN1, UN2, ...UN3. (Faria, page 2, lines 27-38.) User identity codes are not remote computer numbers. The specification of the present application states at page 5, lines 20-24:

“The remote computer number is a number associated with remote receiving computer 18. Examples of remote computer number include a processor number (PN) associated with a particular processor, a chipset number associated with a particular chipset, and a software number that is associated with particular software, such as an operating system, or a combination of them.”

It is clear that the identity codes of UN1, UN2, UN3 .. are not remote computer numbers because there is a different one for each user. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 and claims dependent thereon should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 14, 26, 29, 32, and 34 also refer to a remote computer number and, accordingly, should also allowable. Claims dependent on claims 14, 26, 29, 32, and 34 should also be allowed.

35 USC § 103(a). Claims 4, 5, 18, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faria in view of Schneier, Bruce Applied Cryptography. Claims 7 and 25 stand


rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faria in view of Hartman, Jr., Patent 5,224,166. Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faria in view of Hartman, Jr., Patent 5,224,166. Claims 8-11 and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faria in view of Dent, Patent 5,091,942. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. These claims are dependent on patentable independent claims (see discussion above) and therefore are also allowable.

Note that not all reasons are listed regarding why the claims are patentable over the prior art.

Applicant believes the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the same.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 23, 2002



Alan K. Aldous
Reg. No. 31,905

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
Phone: (503) 264-7125
Phone: (503) 684-6200
Phone (310) 207-3800
Facsimile: (503) 684-3245

APPENDIX (Marked up version of the claims):

Please amend the claims as follows:

20. (Amended) The method of claim 16, wherein [the] other operands are each the processed key.

21. (Amended) The method of claim [16] 17, wherein there are more than one level of XOR operations.

35. (Amended) The [method] system of claim 34, further comprising a processing mechanism to receive a key of which the remote computer number is a component and to produce a processed key and wherein the descrambling is response to which the processed key.